UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

- - - - - - - - X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 13-CR-00220(RJD)

-against- : United States Courthouse

: Brooklyn, New York

BEBARS BASLAN, : Thursday, July 24, 2014

: 9:30 a.m.

Defendant.

:

- - - - - - X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR JURY TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE RAYMOND J. DEARIE SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: LORETTA E. LYNCH, ESQ.

United States Attorney

Eastern District of New York

271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

BY: TYLER J. SMITH, ESQ.

TIANA A. DEMAS, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorneys

For the Defendant: LAW OFFICE OF EPHRAIM SAVITT

260 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor

New York, New York 11201

BY: EPHRAIM SAVITT, ESQ.

Court Reporter: SHERRY J. BRYANT, RMR, CRR

225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201 sbryant102@verizon.net

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by Computer-Assisted Transcript.

703 **PROCEEDINGS** (In open court outside the presence of the jury.) 1 2 (Defendant enters the courtroom.) 3 THE COURT: Counsel -- oh, I think Mike is showing 4 it to you. I may add a phrase in the conspiracy instruction. 5 Given the prominence of the individual Jack, I wanted to make it absolutely clear that Jack could not be considered a 6 7 co-conspirator. All right. Are we ready? 8 MR. SAVITT: Yes. 9 THE COURT: All right, Ellie. 10 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay. Judge, Mr. Savitt indicated that he was 11 MR. SMITH: 12 going to seek an additional instruction on punishment. 13 THE COURT: You did? 14 MR. SAVITT: I did. 15 THE COURT: And that is? 16 MR. SAVITT: And that is to -- I don't know if it's 17 too late to do it right now, but --18 THE COURT: Well, the jury's on their way in, so I 19 suggest you better do it. 20 MR. SAVITT: Better hurry up. So as to Count One, 21 we ask for an instruction to the jury about the mandatory 22 minimum, 30 years. And the reason for that is because the 23 Court of Appeals specifically left it open in the case where 24 they reversed Judge Weinstein. I put it all in an e-mail to 25 Mike. I'll put it in a more formal letter on ECF.

PROCEEDINGS 704

I think I'm obviously arguing against the weight of authority right now, but the reason that I'm asking for it is because, in the circumstances of this case where the defendant was lured across state lines and he's facing a mandatory minimum of 30 years, I believe that this would be an exceptional case where the jury should be so instructed.

I'm putting it on the record in order to preserve my client's appellate rights. I know I didn't do this earlier and I apologize for that.

THE COURT: Yes, this is kind of issue by ambush.

MR. SAVITT: I didn't mean to do that ambush part, but it's my fault. I'm not seeking to make any excuses for that.

THE COURT: Well, there's not a lot I can say on the subject, but given where we are in the proceedings, I'm simply going to deny the request. Bring in the jury, Ellie.

MR. SAVITT: Okay, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm no fan of mandatory minimums. I think everybody knows that.

MR. SAVITT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to do what Judge Weinstein did, refuse to give the instruction.

MR. SAVITT: I understand that too, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Jury enters courtroom.)

705

Good morning, folks. Please be seated. THE COURT: Ordinarily, at this point, I would be giving you my instructions. Given the status of my voice, I think it best that you hear from someone who speaks with a clearer voice than mine, so I've asked my law clerk, with counsel's permission, to read the charge to you.

Please listen carefully. Don't be confused by his references to the first person, because I had intended to give it to you myself. And after you've retired to the jury room, you'll be given copies of the charge, but I invite your very careful attention now. Okay.

THE LAW CLERK: Thank you, Judge.

Members of the jury, now that the evidence has been presented and the attorneys have concluded their closing arguments, it is my responsibility to instruct you on the law that governs this case. Shortly after you retire for your deliberations, I will provide you with several copies of these instructions.

Let me remind you that in accordance with your oath as jurors, it is your duty to follow the law as I state it. You have the important responsibility to judge the facts. And you alone are the judges of the facts, not counsel, not I.

I express no view whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. You should not draw any inference or conclusion as to whether he is guilty or not guilty from anything I may

SHERRY BRYANT, RMR CRR

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

have said or done. You will decide the case solely on the evidence and the law.

The prosecution is brought in the name of the United States, but that does not entitle the government to any greater consideration than the defendant. The parties -- the government and the defendant -- are equal before this Court. They are entitled to equal consideration.

The evidence comes in several forms: Sworn testimony of witnesses, both on direct and cross-examination; exhibits that have been received by the Court in evidence; and facts to which the lawyers have agreed or stipulated.

The following things are not evidence and are to be disregarded by you in deciding what the facts are:

Arguments or statements by lawyers are not evidence.

Questions put to the witnesses, standing alone, are not evidence.

Objections to the questions or to offered exhibits are not evidence. In this regard, attorneys have a duty to their clients to object when they believe evidence should not be received. You should not be influenced by the objection or by the Court's ruling on it. If the objection was sustained, ignore the question and any answer that may have followed. If the objection was overruled, treat the answer like any other answer.

Testimony that has been excluded, stricken, or that

you have been instructed to disregard is not evidence and must be disregarded.

You must not be influenced by sympathy, prejudice or public opinion. I remind you that each of you has undertaken a solemn obligation, a sworn obligation to decide this case solely on the evidence. You must carefully and impartially consider the evidence, follow the law as I state it, and reach a just verdict, regardless of the consequences.

An indictment is merely an accusation in writing. It is not evidence of guilt. It is entitled to no weight in your determination of the facts. The defendant has pleaded not guilty, thereby placing in issue each allegation in the indictment.

The government has the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant. The defendant does not have to prove his innocence. He need not have submitted any evidence at all. The law presumes the defendant innocent of the charges against him. I instruct you that the defendant is to be presumed by you to be innocent throughout your deliberations until such time, if ever, you as a jury are satisfied that the government has proven the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt with respect to the offense you are considering.

I have said that the government must prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The question,

PROCEEDINGS

naturally, is what is a reasonable doubt? The words almost define themselves. It is a doubt based upon reason and common sense. It is a doubt that a reasonable person has after carefully weighing all of the evidence. It is a doubt that would cause a reasonable person to hesitate to act in a matter of importance in his or her personal life. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt must, therefore, be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it in the most important of his or her own affairs.

A reasonable doubt is not a caprice or whim; it is not speculation or suspicion. It is not an excuse to avoid the performance of an unpleasant duty. And it is not sympathy.

In a criminal case, the burden is at all times upon the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The law does not require that the government prove guilt beyond all possible doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is sufficient to convict. This burden never shifts to the defendant, which means that it is always the government's burden to prove each of the elements of the crimes charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

There are, generally speaking, two types of evidence from which you may find the truth as to the facts. One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness or

participant, or physical evidence. The other is indirect or circumstantial evidence, evidence of facts and circumstances from which it is reasonable to infer or deduce connected facts that reasonably follow in the common experience.

There is a simple example of circumstantial evidence that is often used in this courthouse. Assume that when you came into the courthouse this morning the sun was shining and it was a nice day. The courtroom has no windows and you could not look outside. As you were sitting here, someone walked in with an umbrella that was dripping wet. Somebody else then walked in with a raincoat that also was dripping wet.

Now, you cannot look outside of the courtroom to see whether or not it is raining, so you have no direct evidence of that fact. But, on the combination of facts that I have asked you to assume, it would be reasonable and logical for you to conclude that it had been raining.

That is all there is to circumstantial evidence. On the basis of reason, experience and common sense, you infer from an established fact or facts the existence or the nonexistence of some other fact.

There is no distinction between the weight to be given to direct evidence and the weight to be given to circumstantial evidence. No greater degree of certainty is required of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence.

When the attorneys on both sides stipulate, that is,

agree, to the existence of a fact, you the jury must accept the stipulation and consider the fact as proven.

When the attorneys on both sides stipulate that a witness, if called, would have given certain testimony, the jury must accept as true the fact that the witness would have given that testimony. However, it is for you to determine the effect or weight given to that testimony.

The indictment charges "on or about" and "between" certain dates. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact dates of the alleged offenses. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that an offense was committed on a date reasonably near to the dates alleged.

You should weigh all the evidence in the case.

After considering the evidence or the lack of evidence, if you are not convinced of the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt with respect to any charge, then you must find him not guilty of that charge. On the other hand, if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of an offense charged in the indictment, then you should find him guilty of that charge.

I will now turn my attention to the specific charges in the indictment. The indictment contains four counts for your consideration. I will first instruct you on Count One, which charges the defendant with interstate Travel With Intent

to Commit Aggravated Sexual Abuse of a Minor Under Twelve.

Count Three charges the defendant with Attempted Sexual

Exploitation of a Child. Count Four charges the defendant

with Attempted Coercion and Enticement of a Minor to Engage in

Illegal Sexual Activity. And finally, Count Two charges the

defendant with Conspiracy to Sexually Exploit a Child.

Count One reads as follows: "On or about March 19, 2013, within the Eastern District of New York, the District of New Jersey and elsewhere, the defendant Bebars Baslan crossed a state line with intent to engage in a sexual act, to wit: contact between the mouth and the vulva, contact between the mouth and the penis and the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who had not attained the age of 12 years with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person, with another person who had not attained the age of 12 years, to wit: John Doe I and Jane Doe I, individuals whose identities are known to the Grand Jury."

Count One charges the defendant with violating
Section 2241(c) of Title 18 of the United States Code. That
section provides, in relevant part: "Whoever crosses a state
line with intent to engage in a sexual act with a person who
has not attained the age of 12 years shall be punished in
accordance with law."

In order to prove the defendant guilty of Travel

PROCEEDINGS

With Intent to Commit Aggravated Sexual Abuse of a Minor Under Twelve, the government must prove each of the following two elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant crossed a state line; and second, that the defendant did so with the intent to commit a sexual act with a person under the age of 12, specifically, Daniel, who is identified in the indictment as John Doe I, or Leah, who is identified in the indictment as Jane Doe I.

The first element of Count One that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant crossed a state line. I instruct you that to travel from the State of New York to the State of New Jersey, one must cross a state line.

The second element of Count One that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant crossed a state line with the intent to commit a sexual act with a person under the age of 12. The term "sexual act" means: Contact between the mouth and the penis; contact between the mouth and the vulva; or the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who has not attained the age of 12 years with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person. With regard to these types of sexual acts, only "intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who has not

SHERRY BRYANT, RMR CRR

PROCEEDINGS

attained the age of 12 years old" requires the intent that I just described to you. With respect to contact between the mouth and penis and contact between the mouth and vulva, no specific intent is necessary.

To establish that the defendant crossed a state line with the intent to commit a sexual act with a person under the age of 12, it is not necessary for the government to prove that the illegal sexual activity was the sole purpose for crossing the state line. A person may have several different purposes or motives for such travel, and each may prompt in varying degrees the act of making the journey. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, however, that a significant or motivating purpose of the travel across a state line was to engage in a sexual act with a child under 12 years old. In other words, the illegal sexual activity must not have been merely incidental to the trip.

Finally, to establish this second element, the government is not required to prove that the defendant actually engaged in any sexual act, as I have defined that term for you, after he crossed a state line.

The defendant is also charged with Travel With

Intent to Commit Aggravated Sexual Abuse of a Minor Under

Twelve on an aiding and abetting theory. Therefore, you may

find that the defendant is guilty of Count One if you find

that he aided and abetted another person to commit this crime.

PROCEEDINGS

The aiding and abetting statute, Section 2 of Title 18 of the United States Code, provides that: "Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal; whoever willfully causes an act to be done, which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal."

This means that if you find that the defendant knowingly and willfully aided and abetted another person in the commission of a crime, he is as guilty as if he personally committed it.

Before you can convict the defendant on the ground that he aided and abetted a commission of the crimes charged, you must first find beyond a reasonable doubt that another person committed that crime. No one can be convicted of aiding and abetting the criminal acts of another if no crime was committed by the other person in the first place. But if you do find that a crime was committed, then you must determine whether the defendant aided or abetted the commission of that crime.

In order for the defendant to be guilty of aiding and abetting, it is necessary that there be more than mere knowledge that a crime is being committed and acquiescence in the crime itself. The defendant must have willfully associated himself in some way with the criminal venture; he must have willfully participated in it as something he wanted

to bring about. That is, the defendant must willfully seek by some act to make the criminal venture succeed. Mere presence or relationship to the person who actually committed the crime, even coupled with knowledge that a crime was committed, is not enough.

If you find that the government has proven each of the elements of the crime alleged in Count One beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty on Count One. If the government fails to prove any one element, you must find the defendant not guilty as to Count One.

The allegations in the indictment require that in order to sustain its burden of proof, the government must prove that the defendant acted knowingly, intentionally or willfully. An act is done knowingly if done voluntarily or intentionally but not because of mistake, accident or other innocent reason. An act is done intentionally if done voluntarily and with the specific intent to do something the law forbids. In order to prove that the defendant acted willfully, the government must prove that he acted knowingly and purposefully and that he intended to commit an act which the law forbids.

The person need not be aware of the specific law or rule that his conduct may be violating, but he must act with the specific intent to do whatever it is the law forbids. The defendant's knowledge is a matter of inference from facts

716

proved. These issues of knowledge and intent require you to make a determination about the defendant's state of mind, something that rarely can be proven directly. A wise and careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case may, however, permit you to make such a determination as to the state of mind of the defendant. Indeed, in your everyday affairs, you frequently are called upon to determine a person's state of mind from his or her words and actions in a given circumstance. You are asked to do the same here.

The third count of the indictment charges defendant with Attempted Sexual Exploitation of a Child. Count Three "On or about and between February 1, 2013 reads as follows: and March 19, 2013, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York and elsewhere, the defendant Bebars Baslan did knowingly and intentionally attempt to employ, use, persuade, induce, entice and coerce a minor, to wit: John Doe I, John Doe II and Jane Doe I, to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing one or more visual depictions of such conduct knowing and having reason to know that such visual depictions would be transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce, and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and which visual depictions were to be produced using materials that had been mailed, shipped and transported in and affecting interstate and

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

foreign commerce, by any means, to wit: one or more digital cameras."

Count Three of the indictment charges the defendant with violating Section 2251(e) of Title 18 of the United States Code. That section provides, in relevant part: "Any individual who attempts to violate 18 U.S.C. Section 2251(a), which makes it a crime to sexually exploit a minor, shall be punished in accordance with law."

In order to prove that the defendant attempted to sexually exploit a minor, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant intended to commit the crime of sexual exploitation of a minor; and second, that the defendant willfully took some action that was a substantial step in an effort to bring about or accomplish the crime.

To determine whether the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant attempted to sexually exploit a minor, I will first explain to you the law of attempt.

Mere intention to commit a specific crime does not amount to an attempt. In order to convict the defendant of an attempt, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to commit the crime charged, and that he took some action which was a substantial step toward the commission of the crime.

PROCEEDINGS

In determining whether the defendant's actions amounted to a substantial step toward the commission of the crime, it is necessary to distinguish between mere preparation, on the one hand, and the actual doing of the criminal deed on the other. Mere preparation, which may consist of planning the offense, or of devising, obtaining or arranging a means for its commission, is not an attempt, although some preparations may amount to an attempt. The acts of a person who intends to commit a crime will constitute an attempt where the acts themselves clearly indicate an intent to willfully commit the crime, and where the acts are a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in the commission of the crime.

In determining whether the defendant took "a substantial step" towards the commission of a crime, you should consider all of the evidence admitted in the case concerning the defendant and the alleged commission of the crime.

Factual or legal impossibility is not a defense to a charge of attempting to commit a crime if the crime could have been committed had the relevant factual or legal circumstances been as the defendant believed them to be. In other words, a person is guilty of an attempt to commit a crime if, acting with the kind of culpability otherwise required for the commission of the crime, he intentionally engages in conduct

which would constitute the crime if the relevant factual and legal circumstances were as he believed them to be.

I will now explain to you the crime of sexual exploitation of a minor, which is the crime that the defendant is charged with attempting to commit. There are three elements to this crime:

First, that Daniel, who is identified in the indictment as John Doe I, Ellie, who is identified in the indictment as John Doe II, or Leah, who is identified in the indictment as Jane Doe I, was under the age of 18.

Second, that the defendant used or employed or persuaded or induced or enticed or coerced Daniel, Ellie or Leah to take part in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing or transmitting a visual depiction of that conduct.

And third, that the visual depiction was mailed or actually transported or transmitted in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce or using a facility in interstate and foreign commerce or produced using materials that had been mailed, shipped, or transported in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce.

As to the first element of sexual exploitation of a minor, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that at least one of the intended victims, Daniel, Ellie or Leah, was less than 18 years old at the time of the acts

alleged in the indictment. The government does not need to prove that the defendant knew that Daniel, Ellie or Leah was less than 18 years old.

As to the second element of sexual exploitation of a minor, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant used or employed or persuaded or induced or enticed or coerced Daniel, Ellie or Leah to take part in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing or transmitting a visual depiction of that conduct.

The words "used," "employed," "persuaded,"

"induced," "enticed" and "coerced" are words of common usage,
and I instruct you to interpret these words by using your own
common sense. The words "persuade," "induce" and "entice"
are, in effect, synonyms that convey the idea of leading or
moving another person by persuasion or influence as to some
action, state of mind, et cetera, or to bring about, produce
or cause. The word "coerce" means to compel by force and
intimidation or authority, without regard for individual
desire or volition.

A "visual depiction" includes a digitally recorded photograph or video.

"Sexually explicit conduct" means actual or simulated sexual intercourse, including genital-genital, oral-genital, anal-genital or oral-anal, whether between persons of the same or opposite sex; bestiality; masturbation;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

sadistic or masochistic abuse or lascivious exhibition of the genitals or pubic area of any person.

The term "lascivious exhibition" means a depiction that displays to bring to view or attract others to the genitals or pubic area of minors in order to excite lustfulness or sexual stimulation in the viewer. Not every exposure of the genitals or pubic area constitutes lascivious exhibition. In deciding whether a particular visual depiction constitutes a lascivious exhibition, you should consider the following questions: Whether the focal point of the visual depiction is of the minor's genitals or pubic area or whether there is some other focal area; whether the setting of the visual depictions makes it appear to be sexually suggestive, for example, in a place or pose generally associated with sexual activity; whether the minor is displayed in an unnatural pose or in inappropriate attire, considering the age of the minor; whether the minor is fully or partially clothed or nude, although nudity is not in and of itself lascivious; whether the visual depiction suggests sexual coyness or a willingness to engage in sexual activity; whether the visual depiction was intended or designed to elicit a sexual response from the viewer.

It is not required that a particular visual depiction involve all of the factors that I have just listed for you. The importance you give to any one factor is up to

SHERRY BRYANT, RMR CRR

you to decide. While the government must prove that the defendant acted with the purpose of producing a visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct, the government does not need to prove that the visual depiction of that conduct was actually produced.

The third element of sexual exploitation of a minor that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the depiction was transported or transmitted in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce or using a facility of interstate or foreign commerce or produced using materials that had been mailed, shipped and transported in and affecting interstate or foreign commerce. If a visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct, as I have defined that term, is stored on a digital camera or other type of recording device and the camera or recording device crosses from one state to another, then that is sufficient to satisfy the interstate commerce element.

Furthermore, it is sufficient to satisfy the interstate or foreign commerce element if the visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct is recorded or stored on a device that was made either outside of the state of New York or in a foreign country. I instruct you that the parties have stipulated that the camera seized from the defendant on March 19, 2013 was manufactured outside the United States.

Whether or not a minor consented to engage in

sexually explicit conduct is irrelevant, as the consent or voluntary participation of a minor is not a defense to the charge.

To prove that the defendant attempted to sexually exploit a minor, the government does not need to prove that a visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct, as I have already defined these terms, was actually produced or transmitted. Nor does the government need to prove that the visual depiction was actually transmitted in or affecting interstate commerce. The government need not prove that the defendant actually committed the substantive crime of sexual exploitation of a minor. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt: That the defendant intended to commit the crime of sexual exploitation of a minor; and that the defendant willfully took some action that was a substantial step in an effort to bring about or accomplish the crime.

If you find that the government has proven each of the two elements of the crime alleged in Count Three beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty on Count Three. If the government fails to prove any one element, you must find the defendant not guilty as to Count Three.

The fourth count of the indictment charges the defendant with attempted coercion and enticement of a minor to engage in illegal sexual activity. Count Four reads as

follows: "On or about and between February 1, 2013 and March 19, 2013, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York and elsewhere, the defendant Bebars Baslan, using facilities and means of interstate and foreign commerce, to wit: a telephone, did knowingly and intentionally attempt to persuade, induce, entice and coerce one or more individuals who had not attained the age of 18 years, to wit: John Doe 1, John Doe 2 and Jane Doe 1 to engage in sexual activity for which a person can be charged with a criminal offense, to wit: criminal sex act in the first degree, in violation of Section 130.50 of the New York Penal Law and sexual assault, in violation of Section 2C:14-2(b) of the New Jersey Code of Criminal Justice."

Count Four charges the defendant with violating Section 2422(b) of Title 18 of the United States Code. That section provides, in relevant part: "Whoever, using the mail or any facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly persuades, induces, entices, or coerces any individual who has not attained the age of 18 years, to engage in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense, or attempts to do so shall be punished in accordance with law."

In order to prove the defendant guilty of Attempted Coercion and Enticement of a Minor to Engage in Illegal Sexual Activity, the government must prove each of the following

elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the defendant intended to commit the crime of Coercion and Enticement of a Minor to Engage in Illegal Sexual Activity; and second, that the defendant did some act that was a substantial step in an effort to bring about or accomplish the crime.

I have already instructed you on the law of attempt, and you should apply those instructions here. I will now define for you the elements of the crime of Coercion and Enticement of a Minor to Engage in Illegal Sexual Activity.

First, that on or about the dates set forth in the indictment, the defendant used a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, that is, a telephone; second, that the defendant used the telephone to unlawfully, willfully and knowingly attempt to persuade or induce or entice or coerce a person whom the defendant believed to be under 18 years of age to engage in any sexual activity, specifically, Daniel, Ellie or Leah; and third, that if the sexual activity had occurred, the defendant could have been charged with a criminal offense under either New York State or New Jersey State law.

The first element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant used a facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, specifically, a telephone. Transmissions of communications by means of a telephone constitute the use of a facility of

PROCEEDINGS

interstate commerce, regardless of whether the communication actually crossed a state line. However, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the specific communication or communications was actually transmitted by a telephone.

The second element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant used a telephone to unlawfully, willfully and knowingly persuade, induce, coerce or entice a person whom the defendant believed to be under the age of 18 years to engage in any sexual activity. I have already instructed you on the meanings of the terms "willfully" and "knowingly."

I instruct you that the crime of using a facility of interstate commerce to attempt to persuade, induce, entice or coerce a minor to engage in a sexual act is completed when the defendant uses a facility of interstate commerce to attempt to persuade, induce, entice or coerce a person he believed to be under 18 years of age to engage in any sexual activity.

The person with whom the defendant was communicating does not need to be a minor in order for the defendant to be guilty of the charge. It is sufficient if the government proves that the defendant was communicating with an adult intermediary such as a parent or relative for the purpose of leading the person he believed to be under the age of 18 to participate in sexual activity. Nor is it a defense to the crime that the adult intermediary with whom the defendant was

PROCEEDINGS

communicating never intended to allow a minor to be persuaded, induced, enticed or coerced to engage in any sexual activity. The government has met its burden of proof so long as it proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was communicating with an adult intermediary whom the defendant believed would cause, lead or facilitate the minor to engage in sexual activity.

In addition, the sexual act does not need to have been completed in order to find the defendant guilty of the charge. It is not a defense to the charge that, as a result of circumstances unknown to the defendant, he was unable to complete the intended sexual act or acts.

The third element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that if the sexual activity had occurred, the defendant could have been charged with a criminal offense under New York State law or New Jersey State law.

It is a crime under New York State law for a person to engage in oral sexual conduct or anal sexual conduct with another person who is less than 11 years old.

Under New York State law, the following definitions apply: "Oral sexual conduct" means conduct between persons consisting of contact between the mouth and the penis, the mouth and the anus, or the mouth and the vulva or vagina.

"Anal sexual conduct" means conduct between persons consisting

SHERRY BRYANT, RMR CRR

of contact between the penis and anus.

Under Section 2C:14-2(b) of the New Jersey Code of Criminal Justice, an actor is guilty of sexual assault if he commits an act of sexual contact with a victim who is less than 13 years old and the actor is at least four years older than the victim.

Under New Jersey law, the following definition applies: "Sexual contact" means an intentional touching by the victim or actor, either directly or through clothing, of the victim's or actor's intimate parts for the purpose of degrading or humiliating the victim or sexually arousing or sexually gratifying the actor. Sexual contact of the actor with himself must be in view of the victim whom the actor knows to be present.

With regard to the third element of the offense -that if the sexual activity had occurred, the defendant could
have been charged with a criminal offense under New York State
law or New Jersey State law -- you need only find that the
activity would have violated any one of the aforementioned
laws.

If you find that the government has proven each of the elements of the crime alleged in Count Four beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty on Count Four. If the government fails to prove any one element, you must find the defendant not guilty as to Count Four.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

Count Two of the indictment charges the defendant with Conspiracy to Sexually Exploit a Child. Count Two reads as follows: "On or about and between February 1, 2013 and March 19, 2013, both dates being approximate and inclusive, within the Eastern District of New York and elsewhere, the defendant Bebars Baslan, together with others, did knowingly and intentionally conspire to employ, use, persuade, induce, entice and coerce a minor, to wit: John Doe 1, Jane Doe 1 and John Doe 2, individuals whose identities are known to the Grand Jury, to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing one or more visual depictions of such conduct, knowing and having reason to know that such visual depictions would be transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce, and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and which visual depictions were to be produced using materials that had been mailed, shipped and transported in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce, by any means, to wit: one or more digital cameras, contrary to Title 18, United States Code, Section 2251(a)."

Count Two of the indictment charges the defendant with violating Section 2251(e) of Title 18 of the United States Code. That section provides, in relevant part: "Any individual who conspires to violate 18 U.S.C. 2251(a), which makes it a crime to sexually exploit a minor, shall be

punished in accordance with law."

In my instruction as to Count Three, I have already instructed you on all the elements of the substantive offense of sexual exploitation of a minor. I will now instruct you on what the government must prove to show that the defendant conspired to sexually exploit a minor, in violation of 18 United States Code, Section 2251(e).

The essence of the charge of conspiracy is an understanding or agreement between or among two or more persons that they will act together to accomplish a common objective that they know is unlawful. You should understand that a conspiracy is an offense separate from the commission of any offense that may have been committed pursuant to the conspiracy. That is because the formation of a conspiracy, of a partnership for criminal purposes, is in and of itself a crime. Thus, if a conspiracy exists, even if it should fail in achieving its purpose, it is still punishable as a crime.

In order to prove the defendant guilty of Conspiracy to Sexually Exploit a Child, the government must prove each of the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that two or more persons, other than the person referred to as Jack, conspired or agreed; second, that they knowingly and willfully conspired or agreed and that the defendant knowingly and willfully was or became a member of the conspiracy; third, that they conspired or agreed to commit

the unlawful act charged in the indictment -- in this case, the sexual exploitation of a minor -- or, in other words, that the objective of the conspiracy was to commit that unlawful act.

Let me start with the first and second elements that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt. The conspiracy is a combination or agreement of two or more persons to accomplish an unlawful purpose. While conspiracy involves an agreement to violate the law, the government need not prove that the defendant entered into an express or formal agreement, or that he stated, orally or in writing, what the scheme was or how it was to be accomplished. It is sufficient to show that he came to a mutual understanding with another or others to bring about an unlawful act. You may infer such an agreement -- or conspiracy -- from the circumstances and conduct of the parties, since ordinarily a conspiracy is secret.

The second element of conspiracy that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant was or became a member. That is, if you find that a conspiracy existed, you must determine whether he participated in the conspiracy willfully and with knowledge of its unlawful purpose and in furtherance of its unlawful purpose. A person's knowledge is a matter of inference from the facts proved. In that connection, I instruct you that to become a

PROCEEDINGS

member of the conspiracy, the defendant need not have known the identities of every member, nor need he have been apprised of all of their activities. Moreover, the defendant need not have been fully informed as to all of the details, or the scope, of the conspiracy in order to justify an inference of knowledge on his part.

The extent or duration of the defendant's participation has no bearing on the issue of the defendant's guilt. An equal role is not what the law requires. If you find that the conspiracy existed and if you further find that the defendant participated in it knowingly and willfully, the extent or degree of his participation is not material.

Moreover, it is not required that a person be a member of the conspiracy from its very start.

I want to caution you, however, that the defendant's mere presence at the scene does not, by itself, make him a member of the conspiracy. Similarly, mere association with one or more members of the conspiracy does not automatically make the defendant a member. A person may know or be friendly with a criminal without being a criminal himself. Mere similarity of conduct or the fact that individuals may have assembled together and discussed common aims and interests does not necessarily establish proof of the existence of a conspiracy.

I further want to caution you that mere knowledge or

acquiescence, without participation, in the unlawful plan is not sufficient to make the defendant a member of a conspiracy. The fact that the acts of the defendant merely happen to further the purposes or objectives of the conspiracy, without his knowledge, does not make the defendant a member. More is required under the law. What is necessary is that the defendant must have participated with knowledge of at least some of the purposes or objectives of the conspiracy and with the intention of aiding in the accomplishment of those unlawful ends.

In sum, the defendant, with an understanding of the unlawful character of the conspiracy, must have intentionally engaged, advised or assisted in it for the purpose of furthering the illegal undertaking. He thereby becomes a knowing and willing participant in the unlawful agreement -- that is to say, a conspirator.

The third element that the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the conspiracy was to commit an unlawful act, in this case, the sexual exploitation of a minor. The government need not prove that the defendant actually committed sexual exploitation of a minor. Rather, what the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the purpose of the conspiracy was to commit sexual exploitation of a minor.

If you find that the government has proven each of

PROCEEDINGS

the elements of the crime alleged in Count Two beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty on Count Two. If the government fails to prove any one element, you must find the defendant not guilty as to Count Two.

I will now instruct you on some general principles you will use in your deliberations.

In deciding whether or not the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt the crimes I have described to you, you must weigh the evidence before you. You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight their testimony deserves. The assumption that a witness will speak the truth may be dispelled by the appearance and conduct of the witness, by the manner in which the witness testifies, by the character of the testimony given, or by evidence contrary to the testimony given.

You should carefully scrutinize all the testimony given, the circumstances under which each witness testified, and other matters in evidence which tend to indicate whether a witness is worthy of belief. Your determination of the issue of credibility very largely must depend upon the impression that a witness makes upon you as to whether or not he or she is telling the truth or giving you an accurate version of what occurred.

Consider each witness's motive and state of mind, possible partisanship in the case, and demeanor and manner

while on the stand. Consider particularly the relationship each witness bears to either side of the case, the nature of that relationship, the manner in which each witness might be affected by the verdict, and the extent to which, if at all, each witness is either supported or contradicted by other evidence in the case.

The question really is, how did the witness impress you? Did the witness's version appear straightforward and candid or did the witness try to hide some of the facts? Is there a motive of any kind to testify falsely or truthfully or to shade the testimony offered? In other words, what you try to do, in plain English, is to size the person up, just as you would do in any important matter when you are undertaking to determine whether or not a person is being truthful, candid, straightforward, or otherwise reliable.

If you believe that a witness has made an earlier statement that conflicts with his or her trial testimony, you should consider whether the witness purposely made a false statement or whether it was an innocent mistake; whether the inconsistency concerns an important fact or whether it had to do with a small detail; and whether the witness had an explanation for the inconsistency that appealed to your common sense.

You have heard the testimony of law enforcement officials. The fact that a witness may be employed as a law

enforcement official does not mean that his or her testimony is necessarily deserving of more or less consideration or greater or lesser weight than that of an ordinary witness. You should evaluate such testimony in the same manner as you would the testimony of any other witness.

Keep in mind that the law does not require the government to call as witnesses all persons who may have been present at any time or place involved in the case, or who may appear to have some knowledge of the matters in issue at this trial. Nor does the law require the government to produce as exhibits all papers and other items mentioned during the course of the trial.

In a criminal case, the defendant has no duty to testify or come forward with any other evidence. He may, of course, choose to take the witness stand on his own behalf. In this case, the defendant, Bebars Baslan, has chosen to testify. As with any other witness, you may take his interest into account in evaluating his credibility as a witness. You should evaluate and examine his testimony as you would the testimony of any witness with an interest in the outcome of the case. However, the government always has the burden of proving the charges against the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. The fact that the defendant has chosen to take the stand and testify on his own behalf does not, in any manner, shift the burden of proof from the government to him.

You have heard reputation and opinion evidence from Maryana Kowal, the other witness for the defense, about the defendant's good character and character trait for truthfulness. You should consider character evidence together with and in the same way as all the other evidence in the case.

You have heard testimony that the defendant Bebars
Baslan made statements following his arrest on March 19, 2013
to FBI Special Agent Aaron Spivack and at a proffer session in
October 2013 to, among others, FBI Special Agent John
Robertson.

You must decide whether the defendant actually made the statements as described in the agent's testimony and, if so, how much weight to give to the statements. In making these decisions, you should consider all of the evidence, including the defendant's personal characteristics and circumstances under which the statement may have been made, as well as the defendant's testimony about those circumstances.

During the trial, typed transcripts were made available to you. These documents contained an interpretation of what was said on the recordings. These documents were given to you as an aid to assist you in listening to the tapes. They are not evidence. When the tapes were played, I advised you to listen very carefully to the tapes themselves. You alone should interpret the recordings based on what you

heard. If you think you heard something different from what appeared on a transcript, then what you heard is controlling. If you cannot determine from the tape that particular words were spoken, you must disregard the transcripts insofar as those words are concerned.

The statements, comments, arguments, demeanor and tone of voice of the attorneys do not constitute evidence.

Nor does anything I have said or done.

Your recollection governs. Nobody else's. Not the Court's -- if I have made reference to the testimony -- and not counsel's recollection. It is your recollection that must govern during your deliberations. If necessary during those deliberations, you may request a reading from the trial transcript that may refresh your recollection.

Please, as best you can, try to be as specific as possible in your request for read-backs; in other words, if you are interested only in a particular part of a witness's testimony, please indicate that to us. It may take some time for us to locate the testimony in the transcripts, so please be patient. And, as a general matter, if there is ever a delay in responding to a jury note, please understand there is a reason for it. None of us goes anywhere. As soon as a jury note is delivered to the Court by the Marshal, we turn our attention to it immediately. If you have any questions about the applicable law and you want a further explanation from me,

or if you want to see any or all of the exhibits, send me a note.

The attorneys in summing up have asked you to draw certain inferences from the evidence in this case. Any inference you draw must be reasonably based on the evidence, and you may infer only such facts that your reason and common sense lead you to believe follow from the evidence. You are not to engage in speculation based on matters that are not in evidence.

You are entitled to your own opinions but you should exchange views with your fellow jurors and listen carefully to each other. Do not hesitate to change your opinion if you are convinced that another opinion is correct. But each of you must make your own decision.

In a few minutes, I will supply you with several copies of my instructions. If you refer to these instructions, keep in mind that you should consider them as a whole. Each part of these instructions is important in your deliberations. And, most importantly, do not let my giving you my instructions discourage you from requesting further instructions or clarification from the Court.

Any verdict you reach must be unanimous. That is, with respect to each count, you must all agree as to whether your verdict is guilty or not guilty.

When you retire to the jury room, you will also be

when summoned by the Court.

PROCEEDINGS

given a verdict form which may well be self-explanatory.

Needless to say, if you have any questions about the verdict form, do not hesitate to ask the Court for further instructions. When you are ready to report your verdict, check the verdict sheet carefully so that it accurately reflects the jury's verdict, and bring it to the courtroom

If you wish during your deliberations to communicate with the Court, for any reason, send me a note through the Marshal. No member of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with the Court by any means other than a signed writing; and the Court will never communicate with any member of the jury on any subject touching the merits of the case, other than in writing, or, more likely than not, orally here in open court.

You will not discuss this case with anyone outside the jury room. And that includes your fellow jurors. You will only discuss the case when all 12 deliberating jurors are together, in the jury room, with no one else present, behind the closed door. At no time is there to be any discussion about the merits of the case, period.

In order that your deliberations may proceed in an orderly fashion, you should have a foreperson. Traditionally, juror number one acts as foreperson. If juror number one prefers not to serve in that role, you can choose a foreperson

PROCEEDINGS 741 1 however you deem appropriate, such as by asking for a 2 volunteer. The foreperson's vote is entitled to no greater 3 weight than that of any other juror. 4 Bear in mind also that you are not to reveal to any person -- not even to the Court -- how the jury stands 5 numerically on the question of whether the defendant is guilty 6 7 or not guilty until after you have reached a unanimous verdict on all counts for the defendant. At that time, you should 8 9 simply send me a note saying, "We have reached our verdict." 10 You will be summoned to the courtroom and the Clerk of the 11 Court will take the verdict. 12 Your oath sums up your duty -- and that is, without fear or favor to any person, you will well and truly try the 13 14 issues before these parties according to the evidence given to you in court and the laws of the United States. 15 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mike. Do either counsel wish to address the Court at sidebar? 17 18 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. 19 (Continued on the following page.) 20 21 22 23 24

742 SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 1 (Sidebar conference.) 2 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 3 Mr. VanRiper certainly did an excellent MR. SMITH: He missed one word in the "No Discussion," which is on 4 iob. He said: "At no time is there to be any discussion 5 page 31. about the merits of the case." He intended to say: "At no 6 7 other time." 8 THE COURT: I'll have him repeat it, repeat the whole thing. Okay? Anything else? Mr. Savitt? 9 MR. SAVITT: No. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 11 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Judge. 12 (End of sidebar conference.) 13 (Continued on the following page.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE COURT: It was brought to my attention that Mike just dropped a word, so we're going to repeat a very limited instruction to you. Go ahead, Mike.

THE LAW CLERK: You will not discuss this case with anyone outside the jury room. And that includes your fellow jurors. You will only discuss the case when all 12 deliberating jurors are together, in the jury room, with no one else present, behind the closed door. At no other time is there to be any discussion about the merits of the case.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mike. Swear the marshal.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Can I ask the marshal please to come forward.

(Marshal sworn.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, this is the court security officer and Deputy United States Marshal who will be stationed outside the jury room during your deliberations, either he or one of his colleagues. If you have any reason to communicate with the Court, simply open the door, hand him a note. He will bring it straight away to the Court, who will address it immediately with counsel and respond as quickly as we possibly can.

We have five alternate jurors in the back row who have been working attentively. Do you have personal belongings in the jury room? I ask you now to go with

SHERRY BRYANT, RMR CRR

PROCEEDINGS 744 Ms. Mulgueen, retrieve those belongings and then come back to 1 2 the courtroom. Do you have a verdict sheet? Have both sides 3 seen it? 4 MR. SAVITT: Yes, sir, we have. MS. DEMAS: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: It's approved by everyone. All right, 6 7 hand it to the marshal, if you would. Just take a moment 8 while we clear the jury room of their belongings, I suspect 9 only a moment. 10 (Pause.) THE COURT: All right. If the alternate jurors 11 12 would be seated and remain with me ever so briefly. Ladies 13 and gentlemen of the jury, you may now retire and consider 14 your verdict. 15 (The jury retired to deliberate at 10:28 a.m.) 16 THE COURT: Please be seated, everyone. Ladies, I 17 know it can be frustrating to be with us, sit and listen 18 attentively to the testimony and at the very last moment be 19 separated from your colleagues on the jury. 20 I hope you understand the need for us to impanel 21 alternate jurors. Sometimes, because of emergencies 22 unforeseen, extended illnesses and so forth, we have to resort 23 to a number of alternate jurors. Indeed, in this case, we did 24 almost at the outset of the trial. 25 So we thank you for your service. I'm not going to

formally excuse you at the moment, because the trial continues with the jury's deliberations. And for that reason, I'll ask you to continue to abide by my instruction not to discuss the case with anyone until this jury completes its work. At that point, you are free to discuss the case with anyone you choose to, or not, as you decide. Speaking on behalf of counsel, I'm sure your wishes in that regard will be respected.

So we ask you to step downstairs to the second floor so that an accurate record of your service to the court is maintained by our clerk. Other than that, you are free to leave the building and you'll be notified if for any reason your continued service is needed. Thank you again for your time. Ellie will be here. Mike, would you just escort them out to the hall while we wait for Ellie's return.

Thank you again, ladies.

(Alternate jurors exit the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. Well, if you're going to leave the room, make sure that Ellie knows exactly where and how to reach you. And as soon as we hear any word, obviously, we'll be in touch with you. Anything else?

MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor.

MS. DEMAS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. To be continued then. Thank

24 you.

25 (Recess.)

746 **PROCEEDINGS** (In open court outside the presence of the jury.) 1 2 (The defendant enters the courtroom.) (Court Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 received in evidence.) 3 4 THE COURT: I take it Court Exhibit 1 was the copy of the charge? 5 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes. Court Exhibit 1 is the 6 7 charge; and Court Exhibit 2 is the jury note. THE COURT: Court Exhibit 2 is our first jury note. 8 9 I have some questions about it. As to the summation of Mr. 10 Savitt, as eloquent as it was, they're not going to get it, 11 because it's not evidence in the case. 12 MR. SAVITT: Understood. 13 THE COURT: The binders, those are transcripts, which technically are not evidence, but I have no objection to 14 them seeing them as long as I remind them that they are not 15 16 evidence and that the tapes themselves are, in fact, 17 available. 18 Testimony of the -- I assume they mean of the 19 Is that in printed form that we can provide, in 20 clean copy, or do we have to hear it in court? 21 MS. DEMAS: Your Honor, we have not yet received a transcript from yesterday from the court reporter. I believe 22 your deputy made an effort to obtain it. 23 24 THE COURT: Any idea where that is? While we're 25 looking into that, what are the five CDs?

PROCEEDINGS 747 I think that refers to Government 1 MR. SMITH: 2 Exhibits 1 through 5, which were the CDs of the audio 3 recordings. 4 THE COURT: I see. Do we have the capability of giving them that in the jury room or do they have to hear it 5 here? 6 7 MS. DEMAS: Your Honor, if they have a device on 8 which to play it, we can give it to them in the jury room. 9 THE COURT: Is it safe? They couldn't access any other information? 10 11 MS. DEMAS: One of the exhibits is a video slash --12 includes child pornography, but they are entitled -- it's in 13 evidence. 14 THE COURT: I understand that. If we played all those CDs here in the courtroom, how much time are we talking 15 16 about? 17 MR. SMITH: We played approximately three hours' 18 worth of audio. 19 THE COURT: So what can we do? Is it possible to provide it to them? 20 21 MS. DEMAS: Yes. 22 The testimony of the witness who THE COURT: 23 discussed the Lolita files, I forget the gentleman's name. 24 MR. SMITH: That was Special Agent Phung. 25 THE COURT: Do we have that in printed form?

	PROCEEDINGS 748
1	MR. SMITH: We have that in printed form. We're
2	pulling a copy of that.
3	MR. SAVITT: She's no gentleman, Your Honor. That's
4	a female agent.
5	THE COURT: Right. And any objection if we clean it
6	up and send it in? I don't know that there's anything we have
7	to clean out of it.
8	MS. DEMAS: No, Your Honor. I've looked at it and I
9	did not see anything to clean out of that testimony.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Savitt?
11	MR. SAVITT: Your Honor, I frankly have not had a
12	chance to look at it. I accept counsel's representation, but,
13	in the interest of caution, I'll take a quick look at it.
14	THE COURT: Please do.
15	"Properties of the audited files," what does that
16	mean?
17	MR. SMITH: That, we don't know.
18	THE COURT: I'll ask them. 23A, B and C, we have
19	those?
20	MS. DEMAS: Yes. Those are phone records.
21	THE COURT: And the list of charges they now have in
22	the instructions.
23	So, all right, let's see.
24	MS. DEMAS: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I should be
25	clear. I think it's theoretically possible to give the jury

access to the CDs, but we would need to get a laptop from our office that doesn't have anybody else's information on it, so that could take some time. I mean, I will make an effort to go over there now and find out if they can give us a clean laptop to play it on.

THE COURT: All right. Otherwise, we have three hours of it here in the courtroom.

MR. SMITH: I mean, they may only be interested in certain portions, and we can certainly ask them if there are things that they specifically want to listen to. We could likely identify things with some speed.

THE COURT: Okay. And testimony of -- we can provide them with the testimony of the witness who discussed the Lolita files. Eventually, we'll get the defendant's testimony.

Have we found out where the transcript stands, Ellie?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: She's going to bring it up.

THE COURT: Oh, she's going to bring it up?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes. She's printing it out.

She's going to bring it up.

THE COURT: We're going to have that momentarily. You can do the same thing there, read it, make sure it's clean, as we say, and we can provide it to them. I'll ask about number 6. Number 7, there's no dispute.

	PROCEEDINGS 750
1	And the second note I assume involves Exhibit 55,
2	was it?
3	MR. SMITH: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Which you have available?
5	MR. SMITH: We have that.
6	THE COURT: Okay. So we have 55, 23A, B and C, the
7	transcripts.
8	MR. SAVITT: Your Honor, I'll put it on the record
9	anyhow. I just want to be sure, if my memory serves me
10	correctly, that the five CDs that we're talking about relate
11	exclusively to the Massre recordings and to nothing else.
12	MR. SMITH: They're audio recordings that were
13	consensual recordings made by the government's informant.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Bring them in, Ellie.
15	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Certainly.
16	MS. DEMAS: I'm sorry, Your Honor, did you want us
17	to be able to provide the jury with more than one transcript
18	binder or will one suffice? If we need to get them all, I'll
19	go back to the office.
20	THE COURT: I'd get 12 of them.
21	MS. DEMAS: Twelve? Okay.
22	THE COURT: Do you have one now?
23	MS. DEMAS: I do have one now, and we're sending the
24	intern to get the rest.
25	THE COURT: Well, give us the one you have and we'll

send that in.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 11:25 a.m.)

THE COURT: We have a couple of notes and I'd like to review them with you. Your first request involves eight numbered items, and I'll tick them off one at a time and respond accordingly.

The first, you asked for the summation for the defense. As I told you throughout the trial, the statements of counsel are not evidence and it will not be provided to you.

Transcript binders. We have -- we will provide those binders to you. And first, we're going to provide you with one. We are retrieving 11 more and they will be sent in to you. Please do bear in mind the admonition I gave you at the time we first addressed the subject of transcripts and, indeed, I've repeated it in my final instructions. The transcripts themselves are not evidence. The evidence is on the tapes and they are available to you should you so request. Indeed, it appears that you have in another request.

You asked for the testimony for the defendant. That will be -- logistically, we have to get it from the reporter, okay, review it, make sure there's nothing extraneous in there. And as soon as we've done that, we will send it in to you.

The five CDs you are entitled to. They're in

evidence. You may recall playing them here in court involved approximately three hours of playing time. We are figuring out logistically a way of providing them to you in the confines of the jury room, okay? If that's doable, all well and good. If not, we will begin playing them here in the courtroom.

Now, at any time with respect to any of these items, you are in control. Okay? Let me explain to you what I mean. Juries will ordinarily ask for exhibits in sort of generic form. You may have something very specific in mind and you're not quite sure where it is, so you ask for a large body of information. Perfectly understandable. And sometimes there's simply no other way of going about it.

But if at any time you hear something that you were looking for, you can stop us at any time. You're in full control here. The only thing I don't want you to do is while you're here in the courtroom have any discussion about it. Okay? I'm going to ask you when you go back to talk over what I've discussed, and if you have any further questions or comments or requests, of course, you make them, but be very vigilant. Once that jury room door opens, okay, don't discuss the case. Absolutely critical.

Perfectly human. You're in the middle of deliberations. You've got certain questions. You hear certain information. Perfectly understandable that you should

react immediately. Hold any reaction and exchange among yourselves until you get into that jury room behind the closed door.

So we'll do our best with the CDs and let you know how we make out.

The testimony of the witness regarding the Lolita files will be provided to you in short order.

We have a question about item 6. It requests, and I quote: "Properties of the audited files." We're not entirely sure what you're requesting. If you could try to be a little more specific so we might make an informed judgment as to what that is. But as of now, we're not entirely certain what you've requested.

Exhibits 23A, B and C are here and they will be provided to you immediately.

A list of the charges you now have in my formal instructions. You now have all the charges.

And finally, your second note asks for the statement created on the night of the arrest in the hotel. That I believe is a reference to Government Exhibit 55. I have it. It will be provided to you momentarily.

So, to review, summations of the defense will not be provided. Transcripts will. Testimony of the defendant eventually will be provided, as will the CDs once we figure out logistically whether we can give it to you in the jury

	PROCEEDINGS 754
1	room or we need to do it here in the courtroom. Testimony of
2	the witness regarding the Lolita files will be provided.
3	You'll consider whether you can be more specific about the
4	request for properties of the audited files. Exhibits 23A, B
5	and C will be provided. You have a list of the charges. And
6	Exhibit 55 will be provided.
7	And, with that, we'll return you to the jury room.
8	Feel free to communicate with us and as soon as we have this
9	testimony in order, we will have it to you immediately.
10	(Jury exits courtroom at 11:31 a.m.)
11	THE COURT: Mr. Savitt, you've been through this
12	pile of documents?
13	MR. SAVITT: Yes, Your Honor, there are some
14	deletions that I believe are appropriate from the transcript.
15	Just for the record I don't think we'll have too
16	much of an argument about this there's a sidebar at page
17	499. The record itself of Agent Phung starts at 479 and it
18	ends at I'm sorry.
19	THE COURT: I'm sorry. Let's I don't think we're
20	on the same page. You're talking about the agent's testimony
21	regarding the Lolita file?
22	MR. SAVITT: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: I'm not there yet.
24	MR. SAVITT: Oh, I'm so sorry.
25	THE COURT: I'm talking about the documents we've

PROCEEDINGS 755 already assembled in response to their note. 1 2 MR. SAVITT: Oh, that's fine, Your Honor. I apologize. 3 4 THE COURT: As far as the rest are concerned, go through the testimony, and if you have any -- work it out, and 5 6 if you can't, I'll come back. 7 MR. SAVITT: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay? All right then. 9 MS. DEMAS: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: See you shortly. At some point, we will order lunch for the jurors. 11 When their lunch arrives, I will let you know and you can 12 13 retire for your own. 14 (Recess.) (Court Exhibits 4, 5 and 6 received in evidence.) 15 16 THE COURT: I understand that there's agreement 17 reached with respect to the notes. I have Mr. Baslan's 18 testimony ready for the jury. I have Court Exhibits 37 -- is 19 it 37M, N, and Exhibit 370? 20 MR. SMITH: I believe it's 37M through 37Y. THE COURT: Okay. Oh, 37Y. Thank you. And you've 21 22 agreed on that. 23 This is a copy of the March 7 meeting without the 24 video. And the reason we don't give them the video is because 25 we don't have control over it being played in the confines of

756 PROCEEDINGS the jury room on someone's personal computer. 1 2 MR. SMITH: It contains child pornography, so that's 3 exactly right, to prevent it from being copied. 4 THE COURT: So I propose that we include the following note: Ladies and gentlemen, you will note that the 5 6 video portion on one of the CDs that you saw here in the 7 courtroom is not included in the CDs now provided. You may, 8 of course, see the full CD, including the video portion, but 9 we would have to do that here in open court, which is easy 10 enough to arrange. 11 MR. SAVITT: That's fine, Your Honor. Thank you. 12 MR. SMITH: I think that's fine. 13 THE COURT: Who knows? Maybe they're looking for 14 the video portion. Better to get it than not have it, so we 15 at least let them know it's available. 16 Oh, what about this last note? 17 MR. SMITH: We're in agreement as to the last note. 18 That was Exhibits 37M through Y. 19 THE COURT: That's the screen shot of the Lolita files? 20 21 MR. SMITH: Yes. 22 MR. SAVITT: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. If that's the case, then you don't need me. Ellie, here we go. This goes together with 24 that. This goes with that. 25

```
PROCEEDINGS
                                                                 757
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: So we don't need to bring them
1
 2
    out?
 3
              THE COURT:
                           No. Do we have anything outstanding?
 4
              MR. SMITH:
                           No, Your Honor.
              MS. DEMAS:
                           No, Your Honor.
5
                           So they received the other testimony as
              THE COURT:
 6
7
    well?
8
              MS. DEMAS:
                          Yes.
9
              MR. SMITH:
                          Yes.
10
              THE COURT: Has their lunch arrived?
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: No. I anticipate it being here
11
12
    at about 1:15.
13
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: In response to their note asking
14
    for six more copies of the jury charge, I have six more copies
15
16
    going in.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. There you go. I'll see you a
18
    little later.
19
               (Recess.)
               (Court Exhibits 7, 8 and 8A and 9 received in
20
21
    evidence.)
22
               (In open court.)
23
               (The defendant enters the courtroom.)
              THE COURT: We had a note, as you know, that merely
24
25
              "We're ready." I guess the entire courtroom is
    recites:
```

PROCEEDINGS 758 1 assuming they have a verdict. Who knows, we might be 2 surprised. I'll bring them in momentarily. 3 Just for the record, that note that we sent to the 4 jury regarding their question about New Jersey law has been marked 8A as a Court Exhibit. It was agreed upon, was it not, 5 gentleman? 6 7 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Savitt? 9 MR. SAVITT: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right then, let's bring them in. 11 (The jury enters the courtroom at 4:25 p.m.) 12 THE COURT: Sir and ladies, I have your note that 13 reads: "We're ready." Do I assume that means you've arrived 14 at a verdict? 15 THE FOREPERSON: Yes. 16 THE COURT: And is that verdict unanimous? 17 THE FOREPERSON: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Would you tender it to Ms. Mulgueen for my inspection, please. The Clerk of the Court will take the 19 20 verdict. COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count One, how do you find 21 22 the defendant, Bebars Baslan? 23 THE FOREPERSON: Guilty. COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Two, how do you find 24 25 the defendant?

	PROCEEDINGS 759
1	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Three, how do you
3	find the defendant?
4	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
5	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Four, how do you find
6	the defendant?
7	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
8	THE COURT: Please poll the jury.
9	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror number 1, is that your
10	verdict?
11	JUROR NUMBER 1: Yes.
12	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 2?
13	JUROR NUMBER 2: Yes.
14	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 3?
15	JUROR NUMBER 3: Yes.
16	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 4?
17	JUROR NUMBER 4: Yes.
18	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 5?
19	JUROR NUMBER 5: Yes.
20	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 6?
21	JUROR NUMBER 6: Yes.
22	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 7?
23	JUROR NUMBER 7: Yes.
24	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 8?
25	JUROR NUMBER 8: Yes.

760 PROCEEDINGS COURTROOM DEPUTY: 1 Number 9? 2 JUROR NUMBER 9: Yes. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 10? 3 4 JUROR NUMBER 10: Yes. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 11? 5 JUROR NUMBER 11: Yes. 6 7 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Number 12? 8 JUROR NUMBER 12: Yes. 9 THE COURT: All right. The Clerk of the Court will 10 record the verdict. 11 Ladies and gentlemen, your work is complete. 12 However, the record of these proceedings cannot be completed 13 until I acknowledge the extraordinary service that you've 14 rendered the Court in this matter, the obvious sensitivity and diligence you brought to the exercise of the responsibility 15 16 that you willingly assumed, and we record that as a matter of 17 record on these proceedings. 18 I would ask you to stop in downstairs on the second 19 floor to our jury clerk's office so that an accurate record of 20 your service is maintained. Beyond that, you are free to 21 leave, with the collective thanks of counsel and the Court. 22 If you'll step inside for just a moment, if there are any 23 questions you have about your experience, I'll be happy to 24 answer them. Otherwise, you are excused with our thanks. 25 (Jury exits the courtroom.)

PROCEEDINGS 761 1 THE COURT: Is there anything else? 2 MR. SMITH: No. Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Savitt? 4 MR. SAVITT: Your Honor, just in connection with a Rule 29(c) and a Rule 33, which we have to file within 14 5 I want to make an application under those rules on the 6 7 record, with leave to supplement this application with legal 8 and factual arguments beyond the 14-day period. 9 THE COURT: What's your application? 10 MR. SAVITT: My application simply is to be able to file a memorandum in support of the Rule 29(c) and the Rule 11 12 If I can have till early September, Your Honor. 33. 13 THE COURT: Thirty days. 14 MR. SAVITT: Thirty days. 15 THE COURT: Thirty days. Anything else? 16 MR. SAVITT: I don't believe so, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, folks. 18 MR. SAVITT: Thank you. 19 MR. SMITH: Thank you. 20 MS. DEMAS: Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Good day. 22 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 4:29 23 p.m.) 24 25

```
762
                                   INDEX
 1
 2
 3
     EXHIBITS
 4
      Court Exhibits 1, 2 and 3
 5
                                                                  746
      Court Exhibits 4, 5 and 6
 6
                                                                  755
 7
      Court Exhibits 7, 8 and 8A and 9
                                                                  757
 8
 9
                      I certify that the foregoing is a correct
10
     transcript from the record of proceedings in the
11
12
     above-entitled matter.
13
14
                            <u>/s/ Sherry Bryant</u>
                            Sherry Bryant, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```